

### REMARKS

The examiner correctly points out that claim 6 is missing from the claims as filed. The examiner asks that attention be paid to whether the omission of claim 6 has led to errors in claim dependency and the like in subsequent claims. We have reviewed the claims and found no such errors. We assume that the best way to handle this inadvertent claim numbering error is to leave the situation alone, and rely on the PTO to do the renumbering of claims 7-29 when the patent issues.

The examiner has rejected claim 1, the only independent claim, under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Halperin (US 6390996). The examiner is urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 1 very clearly calls for

acquiring the output of a sensor from which information on the velocity of chest compressions can be determined; and

using the information on the velocity to reduce at least one signal artifact in the physiological signal resulting from the chest compression.

There is absolutely no suggestion in Halperin of the second of the quoted limitations. Halperin does teach deriving velocity from an acceleration measurement, but Halperin does not use the derived velocity to reduce an artifact in a physiological signal resulting from chest compression. Velocity is used for an entirely different purpose. As explained in the paragraph at col. 10, lines 30 to 37, velocity is used to determine angular displacements, which are used to compensate the acceleration signal to account for tilting of the sensors during use (Halperin suggests mounting the accelerometers on the rescuer's wrist, where their orientation can vary considerably).

The examiner lists column and line numbers for numerous sentences and paragraphs in Halperin where support can supposedly be found for the examiner's conclusion that Halperin teaches using velocity to reduce an artifact in a physiological signal. But in every instance, the examiner's referenced language teaches nothing of the kind. The only teaching in Halperin of

how to reduce the physiological signal artifact is to use measured acceleration (e.g., col. 9, line 64 to col. 10, line 6; col. 12, lines 8-19).

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on claim 1, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/22/2008

/grogerlee/  
G. Roger Lee  
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906